Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 13 1984
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No. 83-1679

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER, 1983 TERM

PATRICK A. FLANAGAN and ANN BUTLER,
Appellants,

v.

JUANITA C. BRANDON, et al.,
Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court
For The Southern District Of Ohio

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT OF APPELLANTS FLANAGAN AND BUTLER

WILLIAM H. SCHNEIDER
SCHNEIDER, PROHASKA & SAMS
906 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43205
(614) 258-5858

Counsel of Record for
Appellants Flanagan and Butler

COURT INDEX PRESS, INC. — 215 E. Ninth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 — (513) 241-1480

QUESTION PRESENTED

A. Does the Constitution of the United States require that a congressional district plan for a state which was adopted through a good faith effort of the state legislature to draw districts of equal population be invalidated where there are small deviations in population between the districts?

B. Does the Constitution require the use of census blocks in congressional redistricting?

LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO PROCEEDING

A. Parties opposing the Ohio Plan

Juanita C. Brandon
Rose Marie Higenbottam
Gary W. Starr
Raymond J. Wohl
Frank D. Castelli
John Kavlich
Richard R. Mackay
James J. Modarelli
Beryl E. Rothschild
Jeffrey H. Diredman
M. David Fredman
Leonard Davis
Alan Rutsky
Leonard Vannice
Richard Damiani
Thomas Longo

B. Parties defending the Ohio Plan

Richard F. Celeste, Governor
Sherrod Brown, Secretary of State
Patrick A. Flanagan
Ann Butler
Judy Botwin
Barbara H. Boyd
Austin R. Cooper
Russell G. Fox
Cheryle Goode
Joyce Grimes
Terry Meister
Thaddeus Jackson
Eugene Pearson
Shirley Wilson
Steve Wortheim
Carol M. Finnan
John Holleran
Mary Ann Sikorsky
Nancy Toth
Robert J. Babcock
Susan Birmingham Brooks
David L. Dian
Kenneth Loeri
Robert Rodriguez
Karl Toth
Rual Vega
Dorothy Spiker

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Question Presented	1
List of All Parties to Proceeding	1
Table of Contents	iii
Table of Authorities	iv
Reported Decisions Below	1
Grounds for Jurisdiction	2
Constitutional Provision	2
Statement of the Case	3
The Court Should Set This Case for Plenary Consideration With Brief and Argument	11
Conclusion	12
Appendix A – Order and Opinion of United States District Court of January 30, 1984	1a
Appendix B – Order of United States District Court of February 13, 1984	26a
Appendix C – Notice of Appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States	29a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases: page

Flanagan v. *Gillmor*, 561 F. Supp. 36 (S.D. Ohio 1982) .. 1, 5

Karcher v. *Daggett*, — U.S. —, 77 L. Ed. 2d 133, 103 S.C. 2653, 51 U.S.L.W. 4853 (1983) 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12

Kirkpatrick v. *Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526 (1969) 5, 12

Constitutional Provisions:

Article I, § 2, United States Constitution 2

Statutes:

Ohio Rev. Code, § 3521.01 ..... 2, 3

28 U.S.C. § 1253 2

28 U.S.C. § 2284(a) 2, 3

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER, 1983 TERM

No. ———

PATRICK A. FLANAGAN and ANN BUTLER,
Appellants,

v.

JUANITA C. BRANDON, et al.,
Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court
For The Southern District Of Ohio

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT OF APPELLANTS FLANAGAN AND BUTLER

REPORTED DECISIONS BELOW

This action was adjudicated below in two opinions. The first is reported as *Flanagan* v. *Gillmor* at 561 F. Supp. 36, and was rendered May 25, 1982. The second decision rendered January 30, 1984 (Appendix A), as modified February 13, 1984 (Appendix B), is the subject of this appeal and is unreported.

GROUNDS FOR JURISDICTION

A. Nature of the Proceeding

This proceeding is a consolidation of several actions which challenge as unconstitutional Section 3521.01 of the Ohio Revised Code which establishes congressional districts and was effective April 5, 1982. The case was tried before a three judge panel that was convened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284 (a).

B. Entry of Judgment

Judgment was entered on January 30, 1984 (Appendix A). This judgment held that the Ohio Plan did not meet the "equal representation" standard of Article I, § 2 of the Constitution of the United States. On February 13, 1984, the Court issued a clarifying order (Appendix B) which specifically enjoined the use of the Ohio Plan for the 1984 election. That order also denied the motion of orignal plaintiffs Flanagan and Butler to amend the January 30, 1984 order and also denied Governor Celeste's motion for reconsideration. Appellants Flanagan and Butler filed their notice of appeal with the District Court on February 14, 1984 (Appendix C).

C. Jurisdiction

Appellate jurisdiction is conferred upon tnis Court by 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

This action is governed by the first paragraph of Artcle I, § 2 of the Constitution which provides:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the People of the several States, and the Election in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Prior to the 1982 Election and based upon the 1970 census, Ohio had been entitled to twenty-three members of the United States House of Representatives. As a result of the 1980 census, Ohio's representatives in the House of Representatives was reduced to twenty-one. It was, therefore, imperative that new districts be established.

On February 16, 1982, Patrick A. Flanagan, a Montgomery County resident and Ann Butler, a Franklin County resident, filed a class action complaint on behalf of all citizens and electors of the State of Ohio who are qualified to vote for candidates for election to the United States House of Representatives. The complaint alleged that the Ohio General Assembly had failed to enact a law creating the required twenty-one Congressional districts and requested the Court to establish a constitutional redistricting plan unless legislation was adopted by the Ohio General Assembly that established constitutionally acceptable districts. On March 15, 1982, the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit designated a three-judge panel to hear and determine this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284(a).

On March 24, 1982, the Ohio General Assembly enacted a redistricting plan providing for twenty-one new Congressional districts. Amended Substitute House Bill 20 was signed into law by Governor Rhodes on March 25, 1982. Errors were later discovered in the bill, and a corrective measure, House Bill 953, was enacted and made effective April 5, 1982. These bills amended Section 3521.01 of the Ohio Revised Code which section sets forth descriptions of the districts.

On March 26, 1982, Juanita C. Brandon and Rose Marie Higenbottam, also Franklin County residents, moved to intervene in this action. Intervention was granted April 6, 1982. The complaint in intervention alleges that the plan adopted by the General Assembly was unconstitutional in that the new districts unjustifiably deviated from the ideal population for

Congressional Districts. The complaint in intervention also alleged that the new Congressional Districts were drawn so as to purposely dilute and deny the voting rights of Ohio's black citizens contrary to the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. On April 14, 1982, the Court granted the motion of a number of Cuyahoga County residents to intervene as defendants. At the same time, the Court determined that this action should proceed on behalf of a class of citizens and electors of the State of Ohio who are qualified to vote for candidates for election to the United States House of Representatives.

A stipulation was filed on April 19, 1982, which dismissed the defendants Gillmor, Meshel, Riffe and Nixon who were the majority and minority leaders in the Ohio Senate and House of Representatives. Governor Rhodes and Secretary of State Celebrezze remained as defendants in support of the plan. The original plaintiffs Flanagan and Butler having declared their support of the plan, were treated as defendants.

A second action was filed by Gary Starr and others in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio alleging that the Ohio plan violated the one-person one-vote principle required by the United States Constitution. Plaintiff in this suit also contended that the new Congressional Districts violated a claimed constitutional right to "unity of interest" and "convenience of access". On April 2, 1982, an amended complaint was filed in the Northern District action adding as additional plaintiffs certain residents of Middlebury Heights and University Heights, Ohio. This amended complaint additionally alleged that the new Congressional districts fragmented "existing political sub-divisions through obvious political gerrymandering".

On April 9, 1982, a number of electors from the newly created 21st Congressional District moved to intervene as defendants in the Northern District action. In an order dated April 13, 1982, the three-judge District Court in the Northern District granted the motion to intervene as defendants and

transferred the Northern District action to the Southern for the purpose of consolidation with *Flanagan* v. *Gillmor*. The cases were consolidated and trial began on April 17, 1982 and concluded on April 21, 1982.

The issues before the trial court were the allegations that the plan diluted the voting strength of identified racial and religious groups and that the population variations between the districts were too great. The District Court rendered its decision on May 25, 1982. The Court held that the plan was not in violation of any provision of the Constitution regarding racial or religious group vote dilution. The Court held that since the case of *Karcher* v. *Daggett* was pending before this Court the decision on population variances should be postponed until after this Court's decision in that case. The District Court stated:

> "We accordingly will hold in abeyance the issue of whether the Ohio plan satisfies the mathematical precision of *Kirkpatrick, supra.* (*Kirkpatrick* v. *Preston*, 394 U.S. 526, 533-34 (1969) until we have the benefit of the Supreme Court's decision in the New Jersey case."

Flanagan v. *Gillmor*, 561 F. Supp. 36, 50 (S.D. Ohio, E.D. 1982).

The Court denied plaintiffs' motion that the use of the districts adopted by the General Assembly be enjoined for the election of 1982 and the election of 1982 was conducted through the use of such districts.

On June 22, 1983, this Court decided the case *Karcher, Speaker New Jersey Assembly, et al.* v. *Daggett, et al.*, — U.S. —, 51 U.S.L.W. 4953 (1983).

The District Court assigned the case for further argument and on January 30, 1984 issued its decision on the population equality issue (Appendix A).

The Court found that the ideal population of each of Ohio's twenty-one Congressional Districts is 514,193 and that

all districts deviated from this ideal number. The average deviation from the ideal is fourteen hundredths of one percent (0.14%). The range of deviation from the largest district to the smallest is 0.62 percent. The Court stated that "the plan as enacted compares favorably to the other proposed plans" considered by the legislature. The District Court pointed out that the plan was the product of compromise between a Democratic House of Representatives and a Republican Senate. The Court concluded, however, that because there was a variance in population between the districts there was *per se* a lack of a good faith effort to achieve population equality. The Court stated (Appendix A at 14a):

> "Stated rather simply, when population variances can be reduced and those variances are not unavoidable, that there is an absence of good faith in the special sense in which *Karcher* and *Kirkpatrick* use that phrase."

In *Karcher* v. *Daggett* the majority opinion stated at 51 U.S.L.W. 4855:

> Article I, § 2 established a "high standard of justice and common sense" for the apportionment of congressional districts: "equal representation for equal number of people." *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 18 (1964). Precise mathematical equality, however, may be impossible to achieve in an imperfect world; therefore, the "equal representation" standard is enforced only to the extent of requiring that districts be apportioned to achieve population equality "as nearly as is practicable." See *Id.*, at 7-8, 18. As we explained further in *Kirkpatrick* v. *Preisler*, *supra*:
>
> > "(T)he 'as nearly as practicable' standard requires that the State make a good-faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality. See *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 577 (1964). Unless population variances among congressional districts are shown to have resulted despite such effort, the State must justify each variance, no matter how small." 394 U.S., at 530-531.

> Article I, § 2, therefore, "permits only the limited population variance which are unavoidable despite a good-faith effort to achieve absolute equality, or for which justification is shown." *Id.*, at 531. Accord, *White* v. *Weiser*, 412 U.S., at 790.

The District Court in effect held that the words "good faith effort" used in the *Karcher* decision were mere surplusage.

On September 16, 1983 the appellants Flanagan and Butler filed their brief which argued that the redistricting plan adopted by the Ohio General Assembly met the population equality standards of the United States Constitution as those standards were enunciated in the *Karcher* case. Argument was made that the plaintiff-intervenors had not met their burden of proof of showing that the population differences between districts could have been substantially reduced or eliminated.

A review of the several *Karcher* opinions shows that there were ample reasons for the Courts to find that there was not a good faith effort to achieve absolute equality in that case. In the *Karcher* case this Court found that there was not a good faith effort to achieve population equality. The majority opinion stated: "The Legislature had before it other plans with appreciably smaller population deviations between the largest and smallest districts." 51 U.S.L.W. 4854.

The Court also stated:

> "Given that the census-based population deviations in the Feldman Plan reflect real differences among the districts, it is clear that they could have been avoided or significantly reduced with a good faith effort to achieve population equality. For that reason alone, it would be inappropriate to accept the Feldman Plan as 'functionally equivalent' to a plan with districts of equal population." 51 U.S.L.W. 4857.

In *Karcher* supporters of the Feldman Plan attempted to justify the population variance between districts on the basis

of the margin of error in the census figures or on the basis of a fixed one-percent allowable variance in population between districts. The Ohio situation is demonstrably distinguishable from that in New Jersey.

1. Under the Ohio Plan population equality was the goal. All of the witnesses who worked on the plan testified as to their goal of population equality – not some acceptable deviation from equality. The statements of Speaker Vern Riffe, Senate President Paul Gillmor, Senate Clerk James Tilling and Legislative Reference Bureau employee Edith Woodward are uncontroverted.

2. The total deviation of the redistricting plan adopted by the Ohio General Assembly was the least of any plan considered by the Legislature.

3. The Court found in the New Jersey case that it would be easy to reduce the population inequality between districts. The Court stated:

> "As in *Kirkpatrick*, 'resort to the simple device of transferring entire political subdivisions of known population between contiguous districts would have produced districts much closer to numerical equality.' 34 U.S., at 532. Starting with the Feldman Plan itself and the census data available to the Legislature at the time it was enacted, see App. 23-24. 'One can reduce the maximum population deviation of the plan merely by shifting a handful of municipalities from one district to another.' See also *Swann* v. *Adams*, 385 U.S., 445-446, n.4 *supra*. Thus the District Court did not err in finding that appellees had met their burden of showing that the Feldman Plan did not come as nearly as practicable to population equality." 51 U.S.L.W. 4857.

The plaintiff intervenors made no such showing in this case.

4. Extreme gerrymandering was present in the New Jersey plan but was not present in the Ohio plan. The con-

curring opinion of Justice Stevens in *Karcher* began with the following statement:

> "As an alternate ground for affirmance, the appellees contended at oral argument that the bizarre configuration of New Jersey's congressional districts, is sufficient to demonstrate that the plan was not adopted in 'good-faith'. This argument, as I understand it, is a claim that the district boundaries are unconstitutional because they are the product of political gerrymandering. Since my vote is decisive in this case, it seems appropriate to explain how this argument influences my analysis of the question that divides the Court." 51 U.S.L.W. 4861

There follows a lengthly legal analysis of "gerrymandering and its attendant evils". A graphic description of the New Jersey Plan which contains such adjectives as "uncouth" and "bizzare" is set forth. He states:

> "Although I need not decide whether the plan's shortcomings regarding shape and compactness, subdivision boundaries, and neutral decision-making would establish a prima facie case, these factors certainly strengthen my conclusion that the New Jersey Plan violates the Equal Protection Clause." 51 U.S.L.W. 4864.

On this subject of gerrymandering the contrast between the New Jerscey plan and the Ohio plan is striking. In New Jersey the plan was sponsored by the leadership in the Democratic party, which controlled both houses of the State Legislature as well as the Governor's office, and was signed into law the day before the inauguration of a Republican Governor. The plan was designed to reduce the representatives to Congress from the Republican party to a minimum.

In Ohio the redistricting plan was adopted as a compromise between a Republican controlled Senate and a Democrat controlled House of Representatives. The legislation was signed by a Republican Governor. Since the enactment of the Ohio plan a Democrat, Richard Celeste, has become Gov-

ernor and another Democrat, Sherrod Brown has become Secretary of State. Both Governor Celeste and Secretary of State Brown are in support of the Ohio Plan and are appellants of the order of the District Court. The original plaintiffs, Flanagan and Butler, on behalf of whom this jurisdictional statement is filed, are members of the Republican State Central and Executive Committee. The bi-partisan plan adopted by the Ohio Legislature preserved the political balance in the congressional representation that existed prior to the redistricting act. The continued support of the Ohio plan by Ohio's present public officials points to the fairness of the plan in strict contrast to the New Jersey situation dealt with in *Karcher*.

The District Court accepted the theory, completely unsupported in this case, that the use of census blocks in determining the districts would have resulted in smaller population differences between districts.

In Ohio the urban areas are divided into census tracts which are in some cases divided into census blocks. The rural areas are divided into enumeration districts which usually consist of whole townships although some townships are split into two enumeration districts. A look at the map of Ohio showing Congressional Districts shows that, except in Cuyahoga County, the boundary line between contiguous districts is located overwhelmingly in rural areas. There are no census blocks along these dividing lines in the rural areas. Therefore the census units which must be moved between Congressional districts are largely enumeration districts which consist of whole or half townships.

There was no evidence admitted in this case that the use of census blocks would have reduced the population differences between districts nor did the District Court's decision give specific examples.

The District Court ordered that a revised plan for Congressional redistricting shall be forwarded to it for review.

Motions for reconsideration, amendment, and postponement of the redistricting, were filed by the Governor, the original Plaintiffs and the Secretary of State. These motions were denied by the order of the Court entered February 13, 1984 (Appendix B). Notices of appeal and motions for a stay pending appeal were filed by the Governor, the original plaintiffs, Flanagan and Butler, and the Secretary of State. On February 17, 1984, the Court issued a stay of its injunction against the districts as amended by the General Assembly for the 1982 election pending review by this Court.

THE COURT SHOULD SET THIS CASE FOR PLENARY CONSIDERATION WITH BRIEFS AND ARGUMENT.

The established manner of drawing Congressional districts is by the legislatures of the various states. In defining the constitutional standards for these districts this Court has required that the districts be apportioned to achieve population equality as nearly as is practicable. "Nearly as practicable" requires the State to make a good faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality. This is not the "nearly as possible" standard which the District Court has, in effect, established.

The District Court has interpreted *Karcher* to require that every difference in population between congressional districts must be justified by the state no matter how small since it would always be "possible" to move one or more persons from one district to another if the only criteria is precise mathematical equality. This is not a job for legislatures which are made up of many diverse interests and must act by a consensus of their members.

If the District Court's decision that minor differences in population between districts *per se* require the state to justify each variation is followed by other courts practically every state would be subject to a required change in its district

plan since very few, if any, states have no population differences between their districts.

The District Court has nullified the "good faith effort" language of *Karcher* as well as the "as nearly as practical" language of *Kirkpatrick*. The issues in this case should be addressed by this Court since they will form the basis for the redistricting of congressional districts following the next decennial census.

CONCLUSION

This case raises important issues concerning congressional redistricting that should be decided at this time in order to guide the legislatures in the various states in establishing congressional districts following the next census.

It is respectfully requested that the Court set this case for plenary consideration, with briefs and oral argument.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Schneider
SCHNEIDER, PROHASKA & SAMS
906 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43205
(614) 258-5858

Counsel of Record for
Appellants Flanagan and Butler

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Patrick A. Flanagan, et al., Plaintiffs v. Paul E. Gillmor, et al., Defendants	Case No. C-2-82-173
Gary M. Starr, et al., Plaintiffs v. James A. Rhodes, Governor, State of Ohio, et al., Defendants	Case No. C-2-82-394

ORDER

(Filed January 30, 1984)

In accordance with an opinion simultaneously filed herein and for the reasons therein stated, the Court concludes that plaintiffs have sustained their burden of proving that the Ohio Plan does not meet the "equal representation" standard of Article I, § 2 of the Constitution of the United States. A revised plan for Congressional redistricting which satisfies the requirement of Article I, § 2 should be forwarded to this Court

for review within forty-five (45) days of the date of this order.

BY ORDER OF THE COURT

/s/ NATHANIEL R. JONES,
Circuit Judge

/s/ JOSEPH P. KINNEARY,
District Judge

/s/ ROBERT M. DUNCAN,
District Judge

January 30, 1984

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Patrick A. Flanagan, et al., Plaintiffs v. Paul E. Gillmor, et al., Defendants	Case No. C-2-82-173
Gary M. Starr, et al., Plaintiffs v. James A. Rhodes, Governor, State of Ohio, et al., Defendants	Case No. C-2-82-394

OPINION

(Filed January 30, 1984)

Before Nathaniel R. Jones, Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit; Joseph P. Kinneary, United States District Judge; and Robert M. Duncan, United States District Judge.

Duncan, District Judge. This is our second occasion to judicially review the State of Ohio's Congressional redistricting plan (Ohio Plan) which effectively became law on March 25, 1982.[1] By an order dated May 25, 1982, we decided not to

---

[1] In 1981 a Congressional redistricting plan, House Bill 20, was introduced in the Ohio House of Representatives. After the House passed the bill on January 27, 1982, the Senate passed an amended

enjoin use of the plan for the upcoming Congressional election and stated that:

> We accordingly will hold in abeyance the issue of whether the Ohio plan satisfies the mathematical precision of *Kirkpatrick, supra* [*Kirkpatrick* v. *Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526, 533-34 (1969)] until we have the benefit of the Supreme Court's decision in the New Jersey case.

Flanagan v. *Gillmor*, 561 F. Supp. 36, 50 (S.D. Ohio, E.D. 1982).

On June 22, 1983, the Supreme Court of the United States decided the case *Karcher, Speaker, New Jersey Assembly, et al.* v. *Daggett, et al.*, — U.S. —, 51 U.S.L.W. 4953 (1983). The Supreme Court held unconstitutional a congressional reapportionment plan enacted by the New Jersey Legislature after the 1980 census.

After receiving certain additional 1980 census material, reading counsels' memoranda, hearing argument, and carefully considering the Ohio Plan in light of the precedential congressional redistricting requirements set forth in the *Karcher* case, we determine that the Ohio Plan fails to meet the "equal representation" standard of Article I, § 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

I

The facts of the case essentially remain unchanged from those set forth in *Flanagan, supra*. Rather than repeat them herein, a historical summary will do.

---

version on February 17, 1982. At that time the legislature was facing a statutory time deadline of March 24, 1982, when petitions of candidacy for Congress had to be filed. A compromise was reached by a Conference Committee; the compromise bill was enacted and signed into law by the Governor on March 25, 1982. The enactment contained a provision postponing the petition-filing deadline until April 5, 1982. Subsequently, because of a number of errors in H.B. 20, a corrective measure, H.B. 953, was enacted and became effective April 5, 1982.

The Parties

Case No. C-2-82-173 was filed February 16, 1982, in this Court as a class action by named plaintiffs Patrick A. Flanagan and Ann Butler. They claimed that the Ohio General Assembly had failed to enact a congressional redistricting plan and requested the Court to establish a plan. Meanwhile the Ohio Plan was adopted. Those named plaintiffs now argue that the Ohio Plan is constitutional. (See Brief of Plaintiffs Patrick A. Flanagan and Ann Butler in Support of Present Ohio Congressional Redistricting Plan.)

Next, in March 1982, Juanita C. Brandon and Rose Marie Higenbottom moved to intervene in Case No. C-2-82-173 in a styled class action attacking the constitutionality of the plan. They vigorously continue the attack.

A number of Cuyahoga County residents were granted intervention as defendants. They support the lawfulness of the plan.

Gary W. Starr, Raymond J. Wohl, Frank D. Castelli, and John Kavlich filed an action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio seeking to have the plan declared unconstitutional (Case No. C-2-83-394). That complaint was amended and additional plaintiffs were added. A number of electors of the 21st Congressional District intervened as party defendants. The case was transferred to this District and consolidated with Case No. C-2-82-173. The *Starr* plaintiffs and defendants have not altered their positions concerning the constitutionality of the Ohio Plan.

The defendants in both cases are the current Governor and Secretary of the State of Ohio.

In the discussion hereinafter, plaintiff-intervenors in the *Flanagan* case and plaintiffs and plaintiff-intervenors in the *Starr* case will be referred to as plaintiffs. Defendants and defendant-intervenors in both cases will be called defendants.

The Ohio Plan

According to the 1980 census, the Ohio population is 10,797,630. The ideal population for each of Ohio's 21 Congressional districts is 514,193. All districts deviate from this ideal number. The average deviation from the ideal is .14%. Six districts have a percentage deviation of .20% or more; fifteen districts have a percentage deviation of .10% or more. District 1 has a population of 515,863, which is 1,694 above the ideal or +.33%. District 7 has a population of 512,706, 1,467 below the ideal or —.29%. The range of deviation between the two districts is .62%, referred to as the total percentage deviation.[2]

The General Assembly had other plans before it. None of them had a lower total percentage deviation, but two of them were better than the final plan regarding average percentage deviation. Earlier this Court concluded that "the plan as enacted compares favorably to the other proposed plans. *Flanagan, supra*, p. 42.

Deviations from the Ideal

At the time of the enactment of the Ohio Plan, the Ohio House of Representatives was controlled by a majority of Democrats, while the Senate was controlled by a majority

---

[2] Certain factual similarities between the New Jersey case and the Ohio case are undeniable. In the New Jersey case, following the 1980 census, New Jersey lost one seat in the House of Representatives. After two unsuccessful attempts at redistricting, the legislature for the State of New Jersey convened and "swiftly" passed a bill introduced by Senator Feldman, president pro tem of the State Senate. Under the Feldman Plan, as the New Jersey plan came to be known, the average variance among districts was .1384% or about 726 people. Under the Ohio Plan, which was also drafted after the 1980 census, the average variance among districts was .14%. In the New Jersey Plan, the variation between the most and least populous districts was .6984% or 3,674 people. In the Ohio Plan, the population difference between the largest and smallest districts was 3,161, *i.e.*, a maximum variation of .62%

of Republicans. Obviously, a bipartisan accord was necessary to pass the legislation.

Senate Majority Leader Gillmor, Speaker of the House Riffe, and Representative Stinziano all testified, in essence, of their awareness of and sensitivity to a requirement that the districts be balanced in population and as close to the ideal number as possible.[3] However, Senator Meshel, Senate Minority Leader, testified that a plan could have been drawn "a lot more closely aligned in equal population." (Meshel Tr. 7-9.)

Edith Woodward, an employee of the Ohio Legislative Service Commission, worked on the preparation of the redistricting plan. She stated that her effort was to plan each district to have a population of 514,173 or as close to that figure as practicable. She was not told by any member of the General Assembly that there was any permissible fixed deviation. However, as we stated in our earlier opinion, Ms. Woodward admitted that with more time a better effort to achieve precise mathematical equality could have been made. *Flanagan, supra,* p. 42.

For the most part larger unit census tracts rather than smaller census blocks were used in preparation of the plan. Use of census blocks could have reduced the extent of a number of variances from the ideal.

---

[3] For example, Senator Gillmor testified: (Gillmor Tr. 4)

> Q. Did you understand that the only variances from the mathematical equality of zero deviation are those that are unavoidable despite a good faith effort to achieve absolute equality or for which justification is shown?
>
> A. It was our feeling that we had to get down to zero if it were possible, yes.

However, Gillmor also stated: (Gillmor Tr. 4)

> Q. I take it then that your answer is yes, the necessity for legislative compromise did have an effect on efforts to achieve absolute equality among the districts. Is that correct?
>
> A. I suppose it may have.

The Ohio General Assembly's efforts to achieve mathematical parity were effected by a number of influences. The omnipresent reality of political compromise surely had a causal relationship to the result. The legislature, in enacting the plan, made efforts to "preserve the core of existing Congressional districts, to achieve relative geographical compactness, and to preserve the political complexion of the districts of incumbent members of the Congressional delegation." *Flanagan, supra,* p. 42. The Ohio Plan was also designed to maintain favorable district constituencies for Representative Louis Stokes, Ohio's only black member of Congress, and Representative Rose Oakar, the only woman member of Congress from Ohio.

In our earlier opinion we found that the legislature could have attained greater precision, and that the variances from the numerical ideal were not shown to be unavoidable. *Flanagan, supra,* p. 47.

Race-Religion

Plaintiff-intervenors contended that the Ohio Plan was purposely designed to dilute the voting strength of Ohio's black citizens. The evidence focused on the black populations in Franklin, Hamilton and Cuyahoga Counties. The May 25, 1982 opinion thoroughly discusses this issue. *Flanagan, supra,* pp. 42-46. In sum, we determined that the evidence fails to establish an invidiously discriminatory racial motive accounting in whole or in part for the districts' boundaries. We previously had occasion to note that if the General Assembly, in enacting a redistricting plan, uses racial demography as a factor in considering the political complexion of a district, and the result is a significant diminution of black voting power, we would be concerned about the lawfulness of such a plan. Under such circumstances a permissible inference of purposeful discrimination could be drawn. *See Flanagan, supra,* n.20.

Finally, we earlier decided that there were insufficient proofs that in dividing the 19th from the 21st District in part between

the two census tracts which together include University Heights, the General Assembly was animated by a purpose to dilute the ability of voters to organize along religious or racial lines. *Flanagan, supra*, p. 46.

II

As this Court noted in its prior opinion and as the Supreme Court noted in *Karcher*, Article I, § 2 establishes a high standard of "justice and common sense" for the apportionment of congressional districts: "as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1964) (footnote omitted). This principle of "equal representation" was defined with greater specificity in the seminal case of *Kirkpatrick* v. *Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526 (1969) when the Supreme Court was faced with a challenge to a Missouri redistricting plan.

In finding the deviations in *Kirkpatrick* unacceptable, the Supreme Court noted that

> [T]he "as nearly as practicable" standard requires that the state make a good faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality . . . .
>
> Unless population variances among congressional districts are shown to have resulted despite such effort, the state must justify each variance, no matter how small.

Kirkpatrick, supra, pp. 530-31.

Therefore, under the rule enunciated in *Kirkpatrick*, "only the limited population variances which are unavoidable despite a good faith effort to achieve absolute equality, or for which justification is shown . . . ." are permissible. *Id.* at 531.

Since the Supreme Court's decision in *Kirkpatrick*, the need to satisfy the mandate of Article I, § 2 for mathematical equality among districts has engendered additional litigation. Without engaging in an exhaustive analysis of all the precedents concerning reapportionment of congressional districts, the

Court notes that the most recent plurality decision of the Supreme Court in *Karcher* v. *Daggett* provides this Court with additional guidance on this question.[4] In *Karcher*, the Supreme Court set forth the analysis which must be engaged in by a court reviewing the constitutionality of a dedistricting plan.

> First, the court must consider whether population differences among districts could have been reduced or eliminated altogether by a good faith effort to draw districts of equal population. Parties challenging apportionment legislation must bear the burden of proof on this issue, and if they fail to show that the differences could have been avoided the apportionment scheme must be upheld. If, however, the plaintiffs can establish that the population differences were not the result of a good faith effort to achieve equality the state must bear the burden of proving that each significant variance between districts was necessary to achieve some legitimate goal.

Karcher, supra, p. —.

As is evident from the above-quoted language, *Karcher* mandates that courts engaged in a constitutional review of congressional redistricting plans employ a two-part analysis. First, the court must determine whether plaintiffs, opponents of

---

[4] This Court has already indicated that there are a number of similarities between the Ohio and the New Jersey Plans. Despite these similarities, the proponents of the Ohio Plan argue that there are dissimilarities between the two cases that allow the Ohio Plan to withstand constitutional scrutiny. Specifically, defendants in this case argue that unlike the New Jersey case, where the legislature had a plan with lower deviations to choose from, the Ohio legislature in this case chose the plan with the lowest deviation. While it is true that the Supreme Court in *Karcher* mentions the fact that the New Jersey legislature had before it other plans with smaller deviations, that fact was one fact among many which led the court to conclude that the deviations were not unavoidable; it was not conclusive. Therefore, the fact that there were no other plans under consideration by the Ohio legislature which contained significantly lower deviations does not mean that the plan that was adopted contained deviations which were unavoidable.

the plan, have sustained their burden of proving population variances which could have been reduced or eliminated by a good faith effort. If, and only if, the plaintiff sustains this initial burden, must the Court move on to the second inquiry or level of analysis. At this stage, the state must bear the burden of proving that "each significant variance" was necessary to achieve some legitimate goal. *Id.* For the sake of clarity, the Court will attempt to elucidate what is required under each prong of *Karcher's* two-part analysis.

A. Good Faith

The first prong of the *Karcher* test requires this Court to make a determination as to whether "the population differences among districts could have been reduced or eliminated altogether by a good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population." *Karcher, supra, p.* —.

In determining what evidence satisfies this first prong of the *Karcher* analysis, this Court has struggled with the "good faith" language of *Karcher* and *Kirkpatrick*. The opponents of the Ohio Plan contend that plaintiffs meet their burden by showing that population variances among districts were not unavoidable and that the variances could have been reduced or eliminated altogether by a good faith effort. Conversely, proponents of the Ohio Plan argue that persons challenging the plan bear the burden of showing that the defendant acted without good faith or with some bad or invidious motive. This Court believes that the opponents of the plan have correctly analyzed *Kirkpatrick* and its progeny.

It is true that at first blush the standard for judging the constitutionality of redistricting plans under Article I, § 2 appears exacting, even harsh for those attempting to draft constitutionally sound redistricting plans. Nonetheless, it would seem that at least with respect to the first prong of the *Karcher-Kirkpatrick* test numerical considerations, *i.e.*, mathematical equality, are of primary significance.

The primary importance of mathematical considerations in

congressional redistricting[8] is apparent when one reads the line of cases concerning apportionment in state legislative districts. In explaining the distinction between apportionment of congressional as opposed to state legislative districts, the Supreme Court has had occasion to note that

> Thus, whereas population alone has been the sole criterion of constitutionality in congressional redistricting under Art. I, § 2, broader latitude has been afforded states under the equal protection clause in state legislative redistricting.

Mahan v. *Howell*, 410 U.S. 315, 322 (1973). *Accord Gaffney* v. *Cumming*, 412 U.S. 735 (1973).

In *White* v. *Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 792 (1973), the Supreme Court reaffirmed the distinction between challenges to congressional districts and challenges to state districts. Interestingly enough, the defendants in *Weiser* also argued that absent proof of invidiousness, population variances did not violate Article I, § 2. The court rejected this argument and "reiterated that the *Wesberry*, *Kirkpatrick* and *Wells* line of cases would continue to govern congressional reapportionments, although holding that the *rigor of the rule* of those cases was inappropriate for state reapportionments." *Weiser*, *supra*, p. 793.

This Court believes that support for the exacting definition of "good faith" may initially be found by contrasting the analysis used in those cases challenging state districts with the more stringent analysis used in cases involving congressional districts.

---

[8] The primary significance of mathematical equality was apparent even before the Supreme Court decided *Karcher* as is evident by the discussion which follows. *See* pp. 11-13, *infra*. Moreover, this Court in its prior opinion acknowledged the primary importance of numerical considerations when it noted that under *Kirkpatrick* a finding that a variance is not unavoidable disposed of the issue of good faith. *See Flanagan*, *supra*, p. 47.

As has already been noted, the proponents of Ohio's plan seem to maintain that the numerical strictures of *Kirkpatrick* and *Karcher* can be avoided in this case because there is evidence that the legislature acted in subjective good faith. In support of their contention, proponents argue that a number of legislative leaders testified unequivocally that the plan in question was in their opinion a reasonable legislative compromise and that efforts were made to achieve population equality. More specifically, the proponents of the Ohio Plan, in support of their subjective good faith argument, contend that the New Jersey Plan, held to be unlawful by the Supreme Court in *Karcher*, is in some significant respects dissimilar to the Ohio Plan. There is no evidence that the Ohio General Assembly enacted the plan on the premise that a deviation lower than the statistical imprecision of the decennial census was the "functional equivalent of mathematical equality" as the District Court found in *Daggett* v. *Kimmelman*, 535 F. Supp. 978, 982-983 (N.J. 1982).

Nothing in the Court's decision here today is meant to suggest that the Ohio legislature acted with invidious motives. The Court has no reason to doubt that the legislature conducted itself in good faith insofar as it strove to obtain an acceptable political solution to a thorny legal and political problem. Clearly, that solution was a compromise with which no one was completely enamoured but which dissatisfied the fewest number of people. However, the absence of evidence of the subjective bad intentions of individual legislators is irrelevant. Such evidence is not required to sustain the burden of proof set forth in the first prong of *Karcher*.

The Court concedes that were the question of "good faith" capable of resolution by use of a standard less exacting than that set forth in *Karcher* and *Kirkpatrick*, we would arguably have a closer case. However, this Court concludes, and is not alone in doing so, that good faith as that term is used in *Karcher* and *Kirkpatrick* is tantamount to a term of art having a special meaning. See *Doulin* v. *White*, 528 F. Supp. 1323,

1328-29 (E.D. Ark. 1982).[6] Stated rather simply, when population variances can be reduced and those variances are not unavoidable, then there is an absence of good faith in the special sense in which *Karcher* and *Kirkpatrick* use that phrase.

In the case at bar, opponents of the Ohio Plan sagely note that this Court has already concluded that greater precision was possible than that which was achieved by the Ohio Plan. *Flanagan, supra,* p. 47. More specifically, this Court concluded that "the variances were not shown to be unavoidable." *Id.* The court went on to note that this failure to achieve mathematical equality could be attributed to a number of factors including the process of legislative compromise, the unit of measurement used,[7] and the hurried manner in which the plan was adopted. *Id.* at 42.

---

[6] In *Doulin* the court similarly rejected attempts by proponents of Arkansas' redistricting plan to persuade the court that good faith means subjective good faith. This Court finds the reasoning of that court persuasive.

It is possible to argue, of course, that if the plaintiffs' burden is limited to showing "variances which can be reduced and which are not unavoidable" then the term "good faith" is rendered meaningless. This Court believes that the definition of good faith herein adopted is entirely consistent with the Supreme Court's opinion in *Karcher*. While the conclusion that the term good faith is in essence synonymous with proof that population variances could have been reduced and were not unavoidable may render the words "good faith" surplusage, this conclusion does not render the term "good faith" meaningless. Rather it results in a greater specificity of meaning for that term. In this regard it can no longer be the subject of dispute that "at some point . . ., population variances *do* import invidious devaluation of an individual's vote . . . ." *White* v. *Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 792 (1973). This language seems to buttress this Court's conclusion regarding the "good faith" language in the line of cases beginning with *Kirkpatrick* and ending with *Karcher*.

[7] This Court concluded in its original opinion that "census tracts are the larger unit of measurement and census blocks are the smaller. By utilizing census blocks, a greater degree of mathematical precision

This Court concluded in its prior opinion and today reaffirms the conclusion that had the legislature exercised the kind of good faith effort to achieve population equality required by the Supreme Court, it would have been able to come significantly closer to that goal than it did. While this Court has no doubt that the legislature was trying to do something in good faith, achieving population equality was not the sole focus of legislative efforts. More specifically, the difficulty arose in this case, as in many others, when the legislature tried to achieve population equality while concurrently pursuing secondary goals. Pursuit of secondary goals will often result in variances where such variances might otherwise not exist. That is precisely what appears to have happened in this case. Specifically, Witness Tilling testified as follows:

> Q. Would it have been possible to draw 21 congressional districts with exactly 514,173 people in each of them, using the data that you had available?
>
> A. Not without seriously disrupting the communities of interest which you have asked me about before. They would be decimated by such a process.
>
> Q. But it would have been possible by ignoring that? Is that your testimony?
>
> A. Basically, I guess I am saying that you can do one or the other.
>
> Q. Then it would also have been possible to draw a plan that varied by less than 3100 people among the districts, wouldn't it?
>
> A. Yes, again, if you are willing to disregard communities of interest and census tract boundaries, you could, indeed, do that.

---

was possible." *Flanagan, supra*, p. 42. While it is true that the Court also concluded that "[t]he evidence at trial was inconclusive on the issue of whether greater precision could have been obtained solely by reallocation of census tracts . . ." *Id.*, at 42, n.5, the failure to make more frequent use of the smaller unit of measure was one factor which led to the Court's conclusion that the variances were not unavoidable.

(Tilling Tr. 127-128.) This testimony suggests that mathematical equality was sacrificed for the pursuit of secondary goals. While the Supreme Court has conceded that there may be permissible variances, such variances must be shown by the defendants to be the result of the pursuit of some legitimate goal or policy. Defendants have failed to make the requisite showing in this case. Moreover, this showing is irrelevant to whether the good faith standard of *Karcher* has been satisfied.

Before moving on to an analysis of the secondary goals proffered as basis or justification for population variances in this case, one final related matter deserves to be addressed. The proponents of the Ohio Plan argue that drafters of a redistricting plan may still be held to have acted in good faith even though they pursued secondary political goals. This argument is little more than a restatement of prior arguments. That is, the proponents appear to be arguing that the burden should not shift to them even though there are "not unavoidable variances" which resulted from the pursuit of legitimate secondary goals provided they are found to have acted in subjective good faith. This argument is rejected by this Court.

Moreover, the Court believes the defendants misconstrue the relevance of the pursuit of secondary non-numerical goals to the question of whether the plaintiffs have met their burden under the first "good faith" prong of the *Karcher* test. The pursuit of secondary non-numerical goals is irrelevant to the first prong "good faith" inquiry as that inquiry has been defined at length in the preceding pages. Generally, consideration of such goals only becomes relevant after the issue of good faith has been resolved and the burden has shifted to the state to justify "not unavoidable variances." The language of *Karcher* supports this conclusion.

> We have never denied that apportionment is a political process, or that state legislatures could pursue legitimate secondary objectives . . . . Nevertheless the claim that political considerations require population differences

> among congressional districts belongs more properly to the second level of judicial inquiry in these cases . . . .

Karcher, supra, p. —.

In this same vein, in considering the legitimacy of the particular secondary goal of preserving political subdivisions, the *Karcher* court noted that "while perfectly permissible as a secondary goal, [pursuit of that political goal] is not a sufficient excuse for failing to achieve population equality without the specific showing described *infra* . . . ." *Karcher, supra*, p. —, n.5.

Therefore, while the pursuit of secondary objectives is certainly permissible after *Karcher*, the presence or absence of such goals does little to militate in favor of finding good faith where the Court has found variances which are not unavoidable. Secondary goals must remain secondary; the primary goal must be equality. The pursuit of legitimate goals may be proffered as justification for "not unavoidable variances," however. In that regard, proof of the pursuit of secondary non-numerical goals is more properly considered as part of the state's proof after the burden has shifted.

B. Legitimate Secondary Goals

Upon a determination that a state legislature did not formulate a congressional redistricting plan containing only those variances which were unavoidable despite a good faith effort to achieve population equality, the burden shifts to the state to justify each significant variance. The state must show that a specific deviation from the ideal is necessary in order to achieve a legitimate state policy goal and that the policy is applied consistently throughout the plan. This second level of inquiry requires a three-part analysis with respect to each district which significantly deviates from the ideal. The state must show (1) that a variation resulted from the legislature's attempt to carry out a legitimate state policy; (2) that the variation was necessary in order to effectuate the policy; and

(3) that the policy was applied consistently throughout the state.

There is language in *Karcher* to the effect that "the state must bear the burden of proving that each significant variance between districts was necessary to achieve some legitimate goal." *Karcher, supra,* p. —. The Court does not indicate what is meant by a "significant variance."

Karcher's recent language is somewhat different from the language previously used by the Supreme Court in *Kirkpatrick.* In *Kirkpatrick* the Supreme Court stated that "the state must justify each variance, no matter how small." *Kirkpatrick, supra,* pp. 530-31. *Karcher,* on the other hand, requires the state to bear the burden of justifying "each significant variance." *Karcher, supra,* at —.

After giving this matter careful consideration, we interpret the language of *Karcher* as follows: In determining whether a variance is significant, the court must consider the total plan, the range of the variances from the ideal, and the nature of the goal or goals of the legislature.

This Court's interpretation of significant, as that term is used in *Karcher,* is supported by the following language from that opinion:

> The showing required to justify population deviations is flexible, depending on the size of the deviations, the importance of the state's interest, the consistency with which the plan as a whole reflects those interests, and the availability of alternatives that might substantially vindicate those interests yet approximate population equality more closely.

Karcher, supra, p. —.

Given the arguable uncertainty surrounding the meaning of the term "significant variance," and in order to adhere to the true spirit of *Karcher,* the state would be well-advised to be prepared to set forth a basis for each variance.

The Supreme Court has acknowledged that a state may have any number of legitimate concerns which will serve

to justify small variances in a redistricting scheme. A state's interest in making districts compact, in respecting municipal boundaries, in preserving cores of prior districts and in avoiding contests between incumbent representatives, have been set forth in *Karcher* as legislative policies which, if applied consistently, and in a non-discriminatory manner, could justify population deviations. *Karcher, supra,* p. —.[8]

1. Preserving Minority Voting Strength

Preservation of minority voting strength is another example of a permissible state policy which may justify variances from the ideal. A state's desire to preserve existing minority voting strength is the logical outgrowth of the prohibition against the dilution of that voting strength. The Court has held it constitutionally impermissible to draw congressional districts in a manner which purposely dilutes the voting strength of an identifiable minority. The decision to preserve existing minority voting strength has not been specifically ruled on in the context of a challenge based upon a failure to reach population equality.

In *Karcher,* however, the Supreme Court indicated that the legislative policy of preserving minority voting strength

---

[8] The court in *Karcher* also noted that some of the policies presented by Missouri in *Kirkpatrick,* which are not presented in this case, could be legitimate justifications for variances. District-to-district differences in the number of eligible voters, or projected population shifts, may in some instances stand.

> We rejected [Missouri's] arguments not because those factors were impermissible considerations in the apportionment process, but rather because of the size of the resulting deviation and because Missouri '[a]t best made . . . haphazard adjustments to a scheme based on total population,' made 'no attempt' to account for the same factors in all districts and generally failed to document its findings thoroughly and apply them 'throughout the state in a systematic, not an ad hoc manner.'

Karcher, supra, p. —— (citations and footnote omitted.)

against the potential of dilution provides a legitimate justification for a population deviation, where a "causal relationship" exists between that policy and the deviation. The District Court, in that case, found no such "causal relationship between the goal of preserving minority voting strength . . . and the population variances." *Daggert* v. *Kimmelman*, 535 F. Supp. 978 (D. N.J. 1982). Observing that the record was "completely silent" on that relationship, the Supreme Court concluded that the District Court's findings were not "clearly erroneous." In so concluding, however, the Supreme Court suggested that the policy of preserving minority voting strength itself is a legitimate one. That policy therefore provides a legitimate justification for a deviation where the facts indicate that it is causally related to the deviation.

The legitimacy of the preservation of minority voting strength, moreover, has been addressed in connection with the congressional reapportionment of districts subject to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In *United Jewish Organizations* v. *Carey*, 430 U.S. 144 (1976), the Court addressed the issue whether racial considerations could be intentionally used in an affirmative manner when reapportioning congressional districts. The Court held that racial criteria may be used in redistricting plans in order to maintain non-white voting strength. *Carey*, *supra*, at 165-168.

If a state may explicitly use racial criteria in drawing districts in a manner which will maintain the minority voting strength of a community, then, as *Karcher* indicates, it follows that the state may also draw districts in a manner which will preserve minority voting strength where it already exists.

While the state in this case did not attempt to justify the Ohio Plan by arguing the preservation of minority voting strength, the state did claim to justify certain variances on the grounds that it was creating "safe" districts for Ohio's only black Representative and Ohio's only woman Representative. The preservation of safe congressional districts

for Representatives Stokes and Oakar in the 21st and 20th districts, respectively, is not only an outgrowth of a policy seeking to preserve minority (protected class) voting strength, but also of an analogous policy of preserving minority representation. Having such representation is important to Ohio's delegation in the Congress. Therefore, the state's goal of preserving safe districts for Representatives Stokes and Oakar is permissible as a justification for necessary small deviations in district population.

Although such a goal is legitimate, the burden remains with the state to show with particularity that certain deviations in the plan were necessary to achieve that goal, and that that goal was applied in a consistent manner throughout the state. There is no evidence before the Court which states, other than in general and conclusory terms, that the only way the state could have achieved the goal in question was to have the variances that appear in this plan.

The Court hastens to add that if upon further consideration of this plan the General Assembly is persuaded, and the state can demonstrate to this Court, that small deviations in connection with this legitimate goal are necessary, then such deviations would certainly comport with the standards of *Karcher*.

2. Political Fairness

Defendants strongly urge upon this Court other justifications for the variances found in the Ohio Plan. Specifically, proponents of the plan argue that to some extent, the population variances were caused by a legislative intent to be politically fair. Generally speaking, it is hard to quarrel with the legitimacy of such a goal. Certainly insofar as this goal reflects a legislative intent to prevent gerrymandering, it is legitimate. *Karcher, supra*, p. — n.6. Before the Court may accept this goal as a legitimate justification for variances, however, the state must relate with particularity how each variance furthers such a goal, *i.e.*, the necessity requirement of *Karcher*. The state must further sustain the burden of

demonstrating consistent application of the concept of political fairness.

Once again, the record in this case reveals that the state has merely asserted in a general way that political fairness justified the variances present in the Ohio Plan. Stated another way, the state has failed to carry its burden under the second prong of the *Karcher* analysis.

3. Political Compromise

This Court is well aware that the Ohio Plan was enacted only after a political stalemate between the parties had been resolved by a dedicated conference committee. Apart from their contention that the Ohio Plan is politically fair, proponents of Ohio's plan appear to be arguing that in order to pass the Ohio Plan, political compromises or concessions from both political parties were necessary. Proponents seem to further argue that the variances in this case can be explained and justified under *Karcher* because the Ohio Plan was the result of such a compromise.

The Court concludes that the political compromise which occurred in this case was not a prospective goal but rather was a retrospective realization of what happened. While political fairness may be a legitimate goal under *Karcher*, *see* discussion *supra*, political compromise in an effort to achieve that goal is not a permissible consideration under either the first or the second prong of *Karcher*. There simply can be no such thing as a consistently applied policy of *ad hoc* political compromise.

4. Communities of Interest

The defendants seek to justify variances in Districts 11 and 19, and perhaps others, by stating that the legislature was concerned with preserving certain interests. We note that the court in *Kirkpatrick* specifically found that the attempt to "avoid fragmenting areas with distinct economic and social interests, thereby diluting the effective representation of those

interests in Congress" was an impermissible justification. *Kirkpatrick, supra,* p. 533.

The defendants have not even indicated to the Court what communities of interest they sought to preserve in Districts 11 and 19, much less what interests were being protected with respect to other districts. There has been no evidence presented that the deviations in any district's population was causally related to a policy of preservation of community interests. Even if defendants have strong state policy reasons to protect certain communities of interest, the defendants must still show that those policies could be effectuated only by permitting small variances and that, with respect to a certain type of interest, the policy was implemented and consistently applied throughout the state.

5. Other Legitimate Goals

The legitimate policy interests enumerated in *Karcher* include making districts compact, respecting municipal boundaries, preserving the areas of prior districts, and avoiding contests between incumbent Representatives. In discussing secondary goals in this opinion, we do not intend to imply that no other secondary goals are available to a state to justify small variances. Once again, however, it should be emphasized that if asserted, legitimate policy interests must be proved by the state in accordance with the standard set forth above.

To summarize, we find that the defendants have not sustained "the burden of proving that each significant variance between districts was necessary to achieve some legitimate goal." *Karcher, supra,* p. ———.

III

The primary thrust of *Karcher* is the Supreme Court's insistence that the "equal representation" standard of Article I, § 2 requires that congressional districts be apportioned to achieve population equality as nearly as is practicable. We

have concluded that with a good faith effort the Ohio General Assembly practicably could have significantly reduced both the average variations from the ideal as well as the total percentage deviation. We reject a standard to determine primary good faith requiring a judicial attempt to hone in on the subjective mentality of a bicameral multi-member legislative authority. What the body did, rather than what certain of its leaders said that they were trying to do, is a far more appropriate and realistic inquiry in this matter. It is rather obvious, in this case, that well-intentioned but secondary considerations significantly account for the nature and extent of the variances.

In the first instance a state cannot account for deviations from the ideal district by factoring in well-meant secondary goal considerations, and then argue that plaintiffs have failed to show a lack of good faith in getting as close as practicable to the ideal number. If this were the case, a state would never shoulder the burden of justifying significant variances resulting from the implementation of secondary goals. *Karcher* holds otherwise. Stated another way, if variances were avoidable, implementation of secondary goals cannot make them unavoidable. Moreover, while the New Jersey secondary goals were arguably different from the Ohio goals, in New Jersey, as in this case, the state failed to bear the burden of proving that each significant variance between districts was necessary to achieve the legitimate goals. Additionally, in both the New Jersey and Ohio Plans the secondary goals, which otherwise may have had the promise of legitimacy, fell short of the mark for the reason that the state failed to show that the goal or policy was consistently implemented state-wide. Accordingly, this Court finds that the Ohio Plan, like the New Jersey Plan, fails to meet the standard of Article I, § 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

IV

This Court is firm in its appreciation of the fact that congressional redistricting is a duty of the Ohio General As-

sembly. Although *Karcher* is to a degree illuminating as to the requirements for constitutionality, redistricting remains a very difficult undertaking for the legislature. Important political considerations are at stake. Nevertheless, it is our expectation that the General Assembly can, with dispatch, present to this Court a revised plan, which comports with the Constitution of the United States. Nothing in this opinion is meant to suggest that the present plan is not amenable to revision or that it is not possible to satisfy the *Karcher* and *Kirkpatrick* requirements by eliminating variances between districts in the present Ohio Plan.

If, and only if, the General Assembly cannot meet its obligation, will this Court be required to provide a plan.

Accordingly, defendants are ORDERED to present the matter to the Ohio General Assembly for its consideration and preparation of a revised plan for congressional redistricting which satisfies the requirements of Article I, § 2 of the Constitution of the United States and other requirements of law. In the event that a plan is not forwarded to this Court for analysis and consideration within 45 days of the date of this order, further action will be taken by the Court.

Nothing in this opinion should be construed as prohibiting the General Assembly from extending the February 23 deadline for filing petitions of candidacy for Congress.

APPENDIX B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Patrick A. Flanagan, et al., Plaintiffs v. Paul E. Gillmor, et al., Defendants	Case No. C-2-82-173
Gary M. Starr, et al., Plaintiffs v. James A. Rhodes, Governor, State of Ohio, et al., Defendants	Case No. C-2-82-394

ORDER

(Filed February 13, 1984)

On February 10, 1984, this Court convened for purposes of hearing argument on a number of recently filed motions in this case.

From the bench, the Court denied the motion of the original plaintiffs for a stay pending resolution of their motion to amend this Court's January 30, 1984 order. The Court also denied the original plaintiffs' motion to amend the January

30, 1984 order and further denied the defendant Governor's motion for clarification and reconsideration of this Court's January 30, 1984 order.

Following the arguments of counsel, the Court has reconsidered its ruling on the defendant Governor's motion for clarification. More specifically, the Court understood counsel to argue at bar that there is some uncertainty concerning whether this Court's January 30, 1984 order operates to enjoin the State from conducting the 1984 primary and general elections using the 1982 Redistricting Plan.

This Court's order of January 30, 1984 specifically held that the

> plaintiffs have sustained their burden of proving that the Ohio Plan does not meet the "equal representation" standard of Article I, § 2 of the Constitution of the United States. A revised plan for Congressional redistricting which satisfies the requirement of Article I, § 2 should be forwarded to this Court for review within forty-five (45) days of the date of this order.

The Ohio Plan is unconstitutional and its use for the 1984 election is enjoined.

In this regard the motion of defendant Secretary of State for an order authorizing the conduct of the 1984 primary and general elections upon congressional districts enacted in 1982 is not well taken and is accordingly DENIED.

The only matter remaining for this Court's consideration is the defendant Governor's request for a stay. During argument, counsel for defendant Governor did refer to a stay pending appeal. More specifically, defendant Governor's motion reads as follows:

> Assuming this Court does not reconsider its decision and that, further, its Opinion and Order, dated January 30, 1984, does enjoin the holding of the 1984 Congressional elections from the present districts, this Defendant respectfully submits that such Order should be stayed to allow proper pursuit of an appeal of the decision.

We construe the foregoing as a motion for a stay. The Court does not believe that a motion for a stay pending appeal is properly before it at this time. The defendant's motion for a stay is therefore DENIED without prejudice.

So ORDERED.

/s/ NATHANIEL R. JONES
Circuit Judge

/s/ JOSEPH P. KINNEARY
District Judge

/s/ ROBERT M. DUNCAN
District Judge

APPENDIX C

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Patrick A. Flanagan, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Paul E. Gillmor, et al., Defendants;	Case No. C-2-82-173
Gary M. Starr, et al., Plaintiffs, v. James A. Rhodes, Governor, State of Ohio, et al., Defendants.	Case No. C-2-394 Nathaniel R. Jones, Circuit Judge Joseph P. Kinneary, District Judge Robert M. Duncan, District Judge

---

NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Filed February 14, 1984)

Notice is given that original plaintiffs, Patrick A. Flanagan and Ann Butler hereby appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the order and opinion of this Court en-

tered in this action on January 30, 1984. This appeal is filed pursuant to Title 28 United States Code, Sections 1253 and 2284(a).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ WILLIAM H. SCHNEIDER
Trial Attorney
Schneider, Prohaska & Sams
906 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43205
(614) 258-5858

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
Patrick A. Flanagan and Ann Butler